UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,674	01/18/2005 Helmut Weyl		10191/4008	2312
26646 KENYON & K	7590 02/12/200 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADY		DINH, BACH T		
NEW YORK, N	NY 10004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/521,674	WEYL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
BACH T. DINH	1795		

	BACH T. DINH	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a concern NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			ie issues ioi
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	·		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s). 7. Sor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 15-17 and 21-30. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		i be entered and an e.	кріапаціон оі
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See continuation sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Kaj K Olsen/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1795	

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

The amendment filed on 12/17/2008 will not be entered because the limitation requiring the spring element being arranged as a spring ring of claim 15 is a new issue not previously considered.

Applicant's argument filed on 12/17/2008 is not presuasive for the argument is directed to the newly added limitation.

With respect to applicant's argument regarding the 102(b) rejection of claims 15, 17-27 and 29-30 as being anticipated by Weyl (US 6,322,681), the limitation "a groove" is interpreted to include "a depression". The spring element disclosed in figures 2C-2E have multiple depressions with respect to the outer edge of the spring element; therefore, the spring element of Weyl comprises multiple grooves, which read on the groove of current claim. As stated in the previous office actions, when the sensor element 3 being inserted into the half-shells 9 and 10, the spring element 1, the insertion force would deform part of the spring element in a direction that is parallel to the longitudinal axis of the sensor element. Furthermore, as a thin element, any forces, including the clamping force, applied to the spring element would deform the spring element in a direction that is parallel to the longitudinal axis of the sensor element. With respect to claim 21, the depressions or the grooves of the spring element are facing away from the half-shells 9 and 10 when the sensor element is assembled. With respect to claim 22, the spring element of Weyl comprises multiple grooves, including the groove that is situated centrall to the spring section. With respect to claim 23, the spring element in figures 2C-2C clearly has wedge-shaped depressions with rounded ends in the direction of the spring section. With respect to claim 24, the depressions are radially inward oriented tounge-shaped area. With respect to claim 25, the spring element of Weyl comprises multiple grooves, including two that are diametrically opposing one another (figures 2C-2E).

With respect to applicant's argument regarding the 102(b) rejection of claims 15, 17-27 and 29-30 as being anticipted by Kojima (US 2001/0025522), the argument is not persuasive for it is directed to the newly added limitation "a spring ring".